HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

REVIEW PETITION No. 31 OF 2007

APPLICANT PETITIONER : Smt. Savitri Bai wife of Shri Uttam, aged about 22 years, Resident of Village Kunwa, Tahsil Sahaspur Lohara, District Kabirdham (C.G.)

VERSUS

NON-APPLICANTS RESPONDENTS :
1. The State of Chhattisgarh, Through: The Secretary, Department of Mahila Avam Bal Vikas Vibhag, C.G. Raipur.
2. The Collector/Additional Collector, Kabirdham (C.G.)
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Sahaspur Lohara, District Kabirdham (C.G.)
4. The Project Officer, Mahila Avam Bal Vikas Vibhag, Sahaspur Lohara, District Kabirdham (C.G.)
5. Smt. Yashoda Bai Wife of Shri Bharat Lal, aged about 25 years, Resident of Village Kunwa, Tahsil Sahapur Lohara, District Kabirdham (C.G.).

APPLICATION FOR REVIEW OF THE ORDER DATED 23.02.2007 PASSED IN W.P.(S) No. 1039/2007 (SMT. SAVITRI BAI VS. THE STATE OF C.G. AND 4 OTHERS)

Single Bench : Hon'ble Justice Shri Satish K. Agnihotri.

Present: Shri P.P.Sahu, Advocate for the applicant.
Shri Y.S.Thakur, Govt. Advocate for the State.

ORDER
(Passed on 20th day of June, 2007)

1. The petitioner has impugned the order dated 27.12.2006 passed by the Additional Collector, Kabirdham, whereunder the appointment of the petitioner was cancelled and one Smt. Yashoda Bai was found eligible for appointment on the post of Angan Badi worker, in Writ Petition No. 1039 of 2007.

2. The petitioner has filed this review petition on the ground that this court has not considered the ground to the effect that the petitioner was not afforded any opportunity of hearing before the Collector. This Court, after

hearing the learned counsel for the petitioner and examining the documents appended thereto, came to the conclusion that the order of the Collector/Additional Collector Kabeerdham was just and proper as opportunity of hearing was afforded to the petitioner.

3. In the review petition, the learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner be granted liberty to take recourse to the other alternative forum that may be available to her, to which the learned counsel appearing for the State/respondents has no objection.

4. In view of the above, the petitioner is at liberty to take recourse to other alternative forum that may be available to her. The order dated 23rd February, 2007 passed by this Court in W.P. No. 1039 of 2007 shall not come in way of decision taking by the higher authorities.

5. Thus, this review petition stands disposed of.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Amit